Appl. No. 10/001,891
Amdt. dated March 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of November 14, 2006

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 18, 23, and 26 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-28 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-7, 10-11, 13, 16-19, 22-23, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,713,021 to Kondo et al. (hereinafter "Kondo"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,075,671 to Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter "Kanevsky"). Claims 2-3, 8-9, 12, 14-15, 20-21, 24, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo, in view of Kanevsky, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,357 to Orr (hereinafter "Orr").

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1, 4-7, 10-11, 13, 16-19, 22-23, and 25-27 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kondo in view of Kanevsky. The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Kondo with the teachings of Kanevsky.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. In order to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, three requirements must be satisfied: all limitations of a pending claim must be expressly or impliedly disclosed by prior art references; there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art for the ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the limitations; and there must be a reasonable expectation of success in making such a combination. (M.P.E.P. § 2143).

Applicants respectfully submit that Kondo and Kanevsky, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1, 4-7, 10-11, 13, 16-19, 22-23, and 25-27.

Claim 1

Amended claim 1 recites, in part, the features of "receiving input identifying a selection criterion" and "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents in response to the input to identify portions of multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion." As recited above, multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion. As a result, portions of multimedia information are printed as recited in claim 1 on a paper medium including at least a first portion extracted from a first multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents and a second portion extracted from a second multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents.

Applicants respectfully submit, based on the discussion below, that Kondo fails to teach or suggest where multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion as recited in claim 1 to print extracted portions of the multimedia information on a paper medium.

Kondo is directed to a multimedia data search system that searches for a portion of multimedia data using view objects corresponding to the portion of the multimedia data. (Kondo: Col. 1, lines 10-15, field of the invention). For example, FIG. 2 of Kondo depicts a multimedia data storage part 11 that stores multimedia data such as text data, image data, audio data, video data, etc. A view object storage part 12 separately stores view objects describing user-specific information such as a keyword and information identifying a portion of multimedia data. (Kondo: Col. 3, lines 54-60).

Moreover, Kondo discloses that a view object management part 13 searches view objects stored in the view object storage part 12. A multimedia data display/reproduction part 14 then retrieves required data from the contents of the multimedia data storage part 11 according to view objects searched by the view object management part 13, and displays/plays the portion of

data as described in view object for each medium in an appropriate way on a display part 16.
(Kondo: Col. 3, line 62 – Col. 4, line 2). In other words, view objects in Kondo are created for searching, and are stored separately from multimedia data. The view objects in Kondo associate portions of the multimedia data with keywords. The keywords in the view objects in Kondo are simply matches or searched to find the corresponding portions of the multimedia data in the separate storage.

Searching view objects in Kondo distinct from multimedia data to match keywords fails to teach or suggest <u>analyzing multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents</u> as recited in claim 1. Kondo is merely directed to searching stored view objects for keywords that have been previously associated with portions of multimedia information. The separately stored multimedia data corresponding to the view objects searched in Kondo is then retrieved and displayed, by invoking a method "display ()" or "play ()" defined, for example, in the view object. (Kondo: Col. 3, lines 39-45).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that searching view objects in Kondo stored separately from multimedia data is substantially different from analyzing multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents in response to input to identify portions of multimedia information that satisfy a selection criterion as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kondo fails to teach or suggest where multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion as recited in claim 1 to print extracted portions of the multimedia information on a paper medium.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Kondo fails to teach or suggest the feature of "printing the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion..." as recited in claim 1. The Office Action thus relies on Kanvensky for its teachings for allegedly disclosing the above recited feature. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Kavensky fails to cure the deficiencies of Kondo identified above. Kanvensky is directed to using a fax machine to print text and multimedia information. But Kanvensky fails to teach or suggest where multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is

analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion as recited in claim 1 to print extracted portions of the multimedia information on a paper medium.

Kanvensky merely discloses in Col. 5, lines 55-65 that the multimedia integration module (pointed to in the Office Action as allegedly discloses printing the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion as recited in claim 1) converts an input continuous video signal into still-images for printing. Converting a continuous signal in Kanvensky into still-images for printing along with text fails to teach or suggest where multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion as recited in claim 1 to print extracted portions of the multimedia information on a paper medium. Moreover, Kanvensky merely discloses that the continuous video signal is converted to still-images, which does not necessarily teach or suggest that multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion to identify portions of multimedia information including at least a first portion extracted from a first multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents and a second portion extracted from a second multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kondo and Kanvensky, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents…" and "printing the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion…" as recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

View Object Creation in Kondo

As discussed above, amended claim 1 recites, in part, the features of "receiving input identifying a selection criterion" and "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents in response to the input to identify portions of multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion." Applicants respectfully submit that the process of creating the view objects in Kondo also fails to teach or suggest the above recited features of claim 1.

For example, Kondo discloses that to create a view object for video data, the user selects a plurality of representative frames from the video data, and selects desired portions of those frames. (Kondo: Col. 5, lines 46-48). Kondo further discloses that the user should input keywords to be associated with the selected desired portions of the frames. (Kondo: Col. 5, lines 60-62). The user in Kondo of the user's own accord views the video data to select portions to be associated with keywords, which is substantially different from analyzing, in response to input identifying a selection criterion, multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents as recited in claim 1 to identify portions of multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion.

Moreover, the user in Kondo merely associates keywords with portions of a single multimedia data file, which is different from the identified portions of multimedia information including at least a first portion extracted from a first multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents and a second portion extracted from a second multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents as recited in claim 1.

Thus, the view object creation process in Kondo fails to teach or suggest the features of "receiving input…" and "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents in response to the input…" as recited in claim 1.

Claim 6

Amended claim 6 recites, in part, the features of "analyzing the printable representation for the first multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion" and "analyzing the printable representation for the second multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion." As recited above, printable representations of a first and second multimedia document are analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion. As a result, a consolidated printable representation is generated and printed that includes at least one portion of the printable representation for the first multimedia document and at least one portion for the second multimedia document that satisfy the selection criterion.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Kondo and Kanevsky, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above recited features of claim 6.

As discussed previously, Kondo is directed to searching view objects, which are different from the multimedia data to which they correspond. Furthermore, the view objects in Kondo are not printable representations of multimedia information as recited in claim 6, nor does the user in Kondo necessarily view a printable representation of multimedia information as recited in claim 6 to create the view object in Kondo. Accordingly, Kondo fails to teach or suggest analyzing printable representations of a first and second multimedia document in response to input as recited in claim 6 to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion.

In regard to Kanevsky, Kanevsky merely discloses that a continuous video signal is converted into a still-image for printing. In Kanevsky, the continuous video signal is different from a printable representation of multimedia information as recited in claim 6, because it is the actual video data. Furthermore, the multimedia integration module of Kanevsky creates the still-image, which is the printable representation of the video signal. Merely creating a printable representation in Kanevsky from a continuous video signal does not teach or suggest that the printable representation for a multimedia document is analyzed as recited in claim 6 in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion.

Accordingly, Kondo and Kanevsky, both individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of "analyzing the printable representation for the first multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion" and "analyzing the printable representation for the second multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion" as recited in claim 6.

In light of the above, Applicants further respectfully submit that Kondo and Kanevsky, both individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of "generating a consolidated printable representation…" and "printing the consolidated printable representation…" as recited in claim 6.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 11

Amended claim 11 recites a paper document that includes one or more pages. As recited in claim 11, at least one page of the one or more pages is imprinted with text information that is extracted from multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents if the text information satisfies a selection criterion. The multimedia information as recited in claim 11 is analyzed in response to input that identifies the selection criterion. The at least one page in claim 1 is imprinted with one or more video frames corresponding to the text information extracted from the plurality of multimedia documents.

In light of the above discussion, Kondo and Kanevsky, both individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest where multimedia information is analyzed in response to input that identifies a selection criterion as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kondo and Kanevsky, both individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest the paper document as recited in claim 11 that includes text information and video frames from multimedia information analyzed in response to input that identifies a selection criterion.

Claims 2-28

In light of the deficiencies of Kondo and Kanevsky discussed above, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 2-3, 8-9, 12, 14-15, 20-21, 24, and 28 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kondo, in view of Kanevsky, and in further view of Orr. Orr simply fails to cure the deficiencies of Kondo and Kanevsky.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 13, 18, 23, and 26 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, 6, and 11, and others. Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, 12, 14-17, 19-22, 24-25, and 27-28 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 18, 23,

and 26 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the

allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further submit that the dependent claims

recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SFP:am
60923526 v1